

Atmospheric and Solar Neutrino Oscillations in ν MSSM and Beyond¹

Qaisar Shafi^{a2} and Zurab Tavartkiladze^{b3}

^a*Bartol Research Institute, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716, USA*

^b*Institute of Physics, Georgian Academy of Sciences, 380077 Tbilisi, Georgia*

Abstract

We show how a unified description of the various two-flavor neutrino oscillation solutions, allowed by the atmospheric and solar neutrino experiments, are naturally realized within the framework of ν MSSM (MSSM augmented with the seesaw mechanism) and beyond, especially grand unified theories. A general mechanism for achieving maximal mixing to resolve the atmospheric anomaly is discussed, and applied to the flipped $SU(5)$ model. Except in the case of MSSM and $SU(5)$, a light sterile neutrino is an inevitable consequence of our considerations. The bi-maximal neutrino mixing scenario is one of the options considered. Neutrino hot dark matter can arise in models with maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_s$ oscillations. A $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry, motivated by the charged fermion mass hierarchies and the magnitudes of the CKM matrix elements, plays a central role.

¹Supported in part by DOE under Grant No. DE-FG02-91ER40626 and by NATO, contract number CRG-970149.

²E-mail address: shafi@bartol.udel.edu

³E-mail address: tavzur@axpfe1.fe.infn.it

The recent atmospheric neutrino results from Superkamiokande (SK) provide new, and increasingly credible evidence for the existence of neutrino oscillations. The atmospheric neutrino data seems consistent with a two-flavor model involving $\nu_\mu - \nu_x$ oscillations, where ν_x could either be ν_τ or a new sterile state ν_s . The data favors a large ($\sin^2 2\theta \gtrsim 0.8$) mixing angle, with $\Delta m^2 \sim 10^{-2} - 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ [1]. The solar neutrino data is consistent [2] both with the vacuum solution in which $\Delta m^2 \sim 5 \cdot 10^{-11} - 10^{-10} \text{ eV}^2$ and $\sin^2 2\theta \sim 0.7 - 1.0$, or the small mixing angle MSW solution with $\sin^2 2\theta \sim (\text{few}) \cdot 10^{-3}$ and $\Delta m^2 \sim (\text{few}) \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ eV}^2$. The ‘vacuum’ solution strongly indicates oscillations between active neutrinos, while the MSW solution can involve either an active or sterile neutrino [2].

The importance of the atmospheric and solar neutrino experiments stems from the fact that they may provide the first unequivocal evidence for physics beyond the standard model. It is hard to see how neutrino masses of order 10^{-1} eV (or greater) can be generated within the framework of the standard model (SM) or its minimal supersymmetric extension (MSSM), even after non-renormalizable interactions are taken into account. Some extension of this framework is mandated, and perhaps the most elegant possibility is to introduce right handed neutrinos which, when coupled with the seesaw mechanism [3], gives rise to neutrino masses and mixings. There are well known extensions of the SM, such as $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ [4], $SO(10)$ [5] or flipped $SU(5)$ [6], which all predict the existence of right-handed neutrinos, and consequently non-zero neutrino masses and mixings.

A consistent theoretical framework for understanding the neutrino oscillation parameters allowed by experiments should also shed light on the observed charged fermion mass hierarchies and the magnitude of the CKM matrix elements. It seems natural to think that there exists some ‘flavor’ (horizontal) symmetry that distinguishes between the generations. In the supersymmetric setting, a global $\mathcal{U}(1)$ - $\mathcal{R}$ -symmetry would provide an example of such a symmetry. Note that the flavor symmetry need not be continuous, and indeed some superstring inspired models suggest the existence of discrete flavor ‘gauge’ symmetries.

In this letter we would like to develop a unified approach, based on ν MSSM (MSSM augmented with the seesaw mechanism) and its grand unified extensions, that incorporates the various two-flavor oscillation solutions allowed by the data. Our approach is strongly guided by the desire to provide a general mechanism for realizing (essentially) maximal mixing in $\nu_\mu - \nu_x$ oscillations, which seems to be favored experimentally, to explain the atmospheric neutrino anomaly. The scheme that we propose here exploits a $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry [7], whose breaking by a ν MSSM singlet field X yields an important ‘expansion’ parameter $\epsilon \equiv \langle X \rangle / M_P = 0.2$, where $M_P = 2.4 \cdot 10^{18} \text{ GeV}$ denotes the reduced Planck scale. In ν MSSM the elements of the quark and lepton Yukawa matrices are expressed in powers of the expansion parameter ϵ , while in GUTs another dimensionless parameter $\epsilon_G (\equiv M_{GUT} / M_P) \sim 10^{-2}$ can also play a role.

A brief summary of our paper is as follows. Within the framework of ν MSSM supplemented by a $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry, we find (see also [8]) that the SK data can be accommodated by implementing $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ oscillations with large mixing to explain the atmospheric anomaly, while the solar neutrino puzzle is resolved via the small mixing angle MSW solution. This scheme has the distinctive features that it does not require the existence of any sterile neutrino, has no ‘hot’ dark matter, and can be extended, more or less straightforwardly, to $SU(5)$. One of its disadvantages is that some tuning of the parameters (with $\sim 1\%$ accuracy) is required in order to achieve the correct magnitudes for the mass squared differences Δm_{atm}^2 and Δm_{solar}^2 . Perhaps a more serious shortcoming of this scheme is that it is not clear how to extend it to other interesting gauge groups such as $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$, $SO(10)$ [9] and flipped $SU(5)$.

We propose a rather general mechanism for realizing (essentially) maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_x$ mixings to explain the atmospheric anomaly. This mechanism inevitably requires the existence of a ‘light’ sterile neutrino ν_s in order to provide a simultaneous resolution of the atmospheric and solar neutrino anomalies. We show how the various two-flavor neutrino oscillation scenarios are naturally realized within the ν MSSM (more precisely perhaps ν_s MSSM to emphasize the presence of a sterile neutrino) framework. The existence of neutrino ‘hot’ dark matter is noted in models that exhibit either bi-maximal neutrino mixing or maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_s$ and small angle $\nu_e - \nu_\tau$ oscillations. The scenario here with bi-maximal neutrino mixings differs from those considered in ref. [10], since it involves a sterile neutrino state. In order to demonstrate the applicability of our approach to models beyond ν MSSM, we show how it resolves the solar and atmospheric neutrino puzzles in flipped $SU(5)$.

We begin with the quark sector and choose the $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor charge of the superfield X to be $Q_X = 1$. Expressed in terms of ϵ , the magnitudes of the CKM matrix elements V_{us} and V_{cb} are as follows:

$$V_{us} \sim \epsilon, \quad V_{cb} \sim \epsilon^2, \quad (1)$$

from which,

$$Q_{q_3} - Q_{q_2} = 2, \quad Q_{q_2} - Q_{q_1} = 1. \quad (2)$$

Note that (2) automatically gives $Q_{q_3} - Q_{q_1} = 3$, so that $V_{ub} \sim \epsilon^3$, which indeed is of the right magnitude. From the known mass hierarchies of the up and down quarks, we have the following ratios of the asymptotic Yukawa couplings:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_u : \lambda_c : \lambda_t &\sim \epsilon^6 : \epsilon^3 : 1, \\ \lambda_d : \lambda_s : \lambda_b &\sim \epsilon^4 : \epsilon^2 : 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

which, taking into account (2), gives

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{u_3^c} - Q_{u_2^c} &= 1 , & Q_{u_2^c} - Q_{u_1^c} &= 2 , \\
Q_{d_3^c} &= Q_{d_2^c} , & Q_{d_2^c} - Q_{d_1^c} &= 1 .
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Expressions (2) and (4) determine the structures of the Yukawa matrices of the up and down quarks (throughout the paper the matrix elements are only determined up to factors of order unity; we also ignore CP violation):

$$Y_u \sim \begin{pmatrix} q_1 & u_1^c & u_2^c & u_3^c \\ q_2 & \epsilon^6 & \epsilon^4 & \epsilon^3 \\ q_3 & \epsilon^5 & \epsilon^3 & \epsilon^2 \\ & \epsilon^3 & \epsilon & 1 \end{pmatrix} , \quad Y_d \sim \begin{pmatrix} q_1 & d_1^c & d_2^c & d_3^c \\ q_2 & \epsilon^4 & \epsilon^3 & \epsilon^3 \\ q_3 & \epsilon^3 & \epsilon^2 & \epsilon^2 \\ & \epsilon & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{5}$$

As emphasized by several authors [7], the flavor $\mathcal{U}(1)$ symmetry can provide a nice understanding of the quark mass hierarchies as well as the CKM mixing angles.

Turning to the lepton sector, let us remark that neutrino oscillations arise from a nontrivial lepton mixing matrix

$$V_{\nu CKM} = U_e^\dagger U_\nu V_\nu , \tag{6}$$

where U_e and U_ν respectively diagonalize the left-handed charged lepton and neutrino ‘Dirac’ mass matrices, and V_ν diagonalizes the matrix $m_D^{diag} M_R^{-1} m_D^{diag}$ (m_D and M_R denote the ‘Dirac’ and ‘Majorana’ mass matrices respectively). Clearly, rotations of the left-handed states $l_i = (e, \nu)_i$ only partially determine the $V_{\nu CKM}$ mixing angles. It seems reasonable to begin the study of lepton mixings with the charged lepton sector, since our knowledge about masses in this sector is so well established.

The well-known hierarchies among the Yukawa couplings of the charged leptons can be written:

$$\lambda_e : \lambda_\mu : \lambda_\tau \sim \epsilon^5 : \epsilon^2 : 1 , \tag{7}$$

from which we conclude that:

$$Q(l_3 e_3^c) - Q(l_1 e_1^c) = 5 , \quad Q(l_3 e_3^c) - Q(l_2 e_2^c) = 2 . \tag{8}$$

From (8), through proper prescription of the charges of l and e^c states, we obtain the following possible choices for the structure of Y_e :

$$Y_e \sim \begin{pmatrix} l_1 & e_1^c & e_2^c & e_3^c \\ l_2 & \epsilon^5 & \epsilon^{2+k} & \epsilon^{n+k} \\ l_3 & \epsilon^{5-k} & \epsilon^2 & \epsilon^n \\ & \epsilon^{5-n-k} & \epsilon^{2-n} & 1 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{9}$$

where

$$0 \leq n \leq 2, \quad 0 \leq k \leq 5 - n, \quad (10)$$

and the $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charges are

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{l_3} &= 0, & Q_{l_2} &= -n, & Q_{l_1} &= -n - k, \\ Q_{e_3^c} &= 0, & Q_{e_2^c} &= n - 2, & Q_{e_1^c} &= n + k - 5. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

For generating neutrino masses through seesaw mechanism one has to introduce right handed ν^c states. In models such as $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$, $SO(10)$ and flipped $SU(5)$ these states are embedded in the unified multiplets. Considering three ν^c states with the following $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charges:

$$Q_{\nu_3^c} = 0, \quad Q_{\nu_2^c} = -n', \quad Q_{\nu_1^c} = -n' - k', \quad (12)$$

the ‘Dirac’ and ‘Majorana’ mass matrices will have the forms:

$$m_D = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \\ \nu_\tau \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1^c & \nu_2^c & \nu_3^c \\ \epsilon^{n+n'+k+k'} & \epsilon^{n+k+n'} & \epsilon^{n+k} \\ \epsilon^{n+n'+k'} & \epsilon^{n+n'} & \epsilon^n \\ \epsilon^{n'+k'} & \epsilon^{n'} & 1 \end{pmatrix} h_u, \quad (13)$$

$$M_R = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1^c \\ \nu_2^c \\ \nu_3^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1^c & \nu_2^c & \nu_3^c \\ \epsilon^{2(n'+k')} & \epsilon^{2n'+k'} & \epsilon^{n'+k'} \\ \epsilon^{2n'+k'} & \epsilon^{2n'} & \epsilon^{n'} \\ \epsilon^{n'+k'} & \epsilon^{n'} & 1 \end{pmatrix} M, \quad (14)$$

where M is some mass scale.

From (13), the contributions from m_D to $V_{\nu CKM}$ (namely the elements of U_ν) are $\theta_{12}^\nu \sim \epsilon^k$, $\theta_{23}^\nu \sim \epsilon^n$, $\theta_{13}^\nu \sim \epsilon^{n+k}$. Note that the diagonalization of the matrix m_D does not change the hierarchical structure of the matrix M_R . As far as the elements of the V_ν matrix are concerned, they are determined from the matrix

$$m_\nu = m_D^{diag} M_R^{-1} m_D^{diag} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \\ \nu_\tau \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e & \nu_\mu & \nu_\tau \\ \epsilon^{2(n+k)} & \epsilon^{2n+k} & \epsilon^{n+k} \\ \epsilon^{2n+k} & \epsilon^{2n} & \epsilon^n \\ \epsilon^{n+k} & \epsilon^n & 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{h_u^2}{M}, \quad (15)$$

which gives $\theta'_{12} \sim \epsilon^k$, $\theta'_{23} \sim \epsilon^n$, $\theta'_{13} \sim \epsilon^{n+k}$. From (15) we have for the masses of the light neutrinos:

$$m_{\nu_3} \sim \frac{h_u^2}{M}, m_{\nu_1} : m_{\nu_2} : m_{\nu_3} \sim \epsilon^{2(n+k)} : \epsilon^{2n} : 1. \quad (16)$$

The mixing angles and masses of the left handed neutrinos do not depend on the $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charges of the ν^c states.

The case with $n = 0$ leads to the desirable large $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing. According to (16) this case also gives $m_{\nu_2} \sim m_{\nu_3}$. To solve solar neutrino puzzle through $\nu_e - \nu_\mu$ oscillations, we need some fine tunings in order to realize a suitably small mass for the ' ν'_2 ' state. For $k = 0$ the solar neutrino puzzle can be resolved through the large angle vacuum oscillations, while $k = 2$ would suggest small angle MSW oscillations. However, in these cases fine tunings to accuracies $\sim 0.01\%$ and 1% respectively must be done. To avoid this 'unpleasant' fact, one can either introduce a sterile neutrino state for solution of the solar neutrino puzzle through small angle MSW oscillations, or perhaps put forward another mechanism for keeping the ' ν'_2 ' neutrino light. The two cases (with $(n, k) = (0, 2)$ and $(n, k) = (0, 0)$), as pointed out in [8], can be realized in MSSM and $SU(5)$ GUT respectively.

In many realistic unified theories, however, the choice $n = 0$ is not realized and so the contributions to the lepton mixing matrix in (6) from the neutral sector are critical if the atmospheric neutrino anomaly is to be resolved. The neutrino 'Dirac' mass matrices in models such as flipped $SU(5)$, $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ and $SO(10)$ mostly have the same 'hierarchical' structure as the mass matrices of up quarks (or leptons in some special cases). This means that the contributions from V_ν to the lepton mixing matrix will also be small if $n \neq 0$ ⁴, unless the neutral sector of the models are suitably modified. As we will see, with our approach this also opens up the possibility of realizing the other allowed two-flavor oscillation solutions within the framework of realistic SUSY GUTs (as well as ν MSSM). The mechanism that we propose naturally leads to maximal mixing between two oscillating neutrino flavors, and turns out to be a powerful tool for model building. By this mechanism a quasi degenerate texture for the mass matrix of the two flavors are obtained, and so the masses of the appropriate neutrino states cannot be changed through fine tunings. For an explanation of atmospheric and solar neutrino anomalies we led to introduce a sterile neutrino state ν_s .

The introduction of the sterile state opens up the following scenarios (that are consistent with the latest solar and atmospheric neutrino data):

a) Atmospheric anomaly is explained through maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing, while the solar neutrino puzzle is resolved by small angle MSW $\nu_e - \nu_s$ oscillations.

⁴The case $(n, k) = (1, 1)$ in (9) can arise from $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ and flipped $SU(6)$ theories with realistic pattern of fermion masses and mixings (see [11] and [12] respectively); the case $(n, k) = (2, 2)$ arises in a simple version of flipped $SU(5)$ model which we consider below.

b) Deficit of atmospheric neutrinos is due to maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_s$ mixings and maximal $\nu_e - \nu_\tau$ mixing resolves the solar neutrino anomaly (bi-maximal mixing scenario).

c) Atmospheric neutrino anomalies still explained by maximal angle $\nu_\mu - \nu_s$ oscillations, while the solar neutrino puzzle is resolved through small angle $\nu_e - \nu_\tau$ MSW oscillations. Below we will present a detailed discussion of how these scenarios are realized, and their phenomenological implications in a model independent way.

Let us demonstrate the mechanism by obtaining maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing, but it can work for any two flavors⁵. We will show mechanism how to obtain large mixing for $n \neq 0$ (this case can include the choice $k = 0$). We introduce two MSSM singlet superfields $\mathcal{N}_{2,3}$, which couple with $\nu_{e,\mu,\tau}$ to form the Dirac matrix. Their $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charges are as follows:

$$Q_{\mathcal{N}_2} = -(p+r), \quad Q_{\mathcal{N}_3} = p, \quad (17)$$

where p, r are integers, and $0 < p \leq n \neq 0, r \geq 0$ (it is important to have $Q_{\mathcal{N}_3} > 0$ and $Q_{\mathcal{N}_3} + Q_{l_3} + Q_{h_u} > 0$; we also took $Q_{l_3} = Q_{h_u} = 0$ for a simpler presentation). The ‘Dirac’ and ‘Majorana’ mass matrices turn out to be

$$m_D = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon^{n+k+p+r} & \epsilon^{n+k-p} \\ \epsilon^{n+p+r} & \epsilon^{n-p} \\ \epsilon^{p+r} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \kappa \langle h_u \rangle, \quad M_{\mathcal{N}} = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon^{2p+r} & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} M \epsilon^r. \quad (18)$$

Here κ and M respectively denote some coupling constant and mass scale and depend on the details of the model. The light chiral neutrinos will acquire mass through the seesaw mechanism. Namely,

$$m_\nu = m_D M_{\mathcal{N}}^{-1} m_D^T = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon^{n+2k} & \epsilon^{n+k} & \epsilon^k \\ \epsilon^{n+k} & \epsilon^n & 1 \\ \epsilon^k & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} m, \quad m = \frac{\kappa^2 \langle h_u \rangle^2}{M} \epsilon^n. \quad (19)$$

From (19) we see that two states are quasi-degenerate with masses $m_{\nu_2} \simeq m_{\nu_3} \simeq m$ and the third ν_1 state is massless since the matrix (19) is obtained by the exchange of the two heavy singlet states. The matrix in (19) generate desired (essentially) maximal mixing [13] in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector.

As may be expected, there is no dependence in (19) on the $\mathcal{U}(1)$ -charges of $\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3$. For the neutrino oscillation parameters we find:

$$\Delta m_{\mu\tau}^2 = 2m^2 \epsilon^n, \quad \sin^2 2\theta_{\mu\tau} = 1 - \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{2n}), \quad (20)$$

⁵Especially interesting may be the case of maximal $\nu_e - \nu_\tau$ mixing which provides the vacuum oscillation solution for the solar neutrino puzzle.

For $n = 1$, $m \sim 0.1$ eV, or $n = 2$, $m \sim 0.2$ eV, one can obtain a value for $\Delta m_{\mu\tau}^2$ ($\sim 3 \times 10^{-3}$ eV²) that is consistent with the atmospheric neutrino results. For either case $n = 1$ or 2 , the model must be arranged such that these values for m are realized. Note that the neutrino masses in both cases are much too small for any significant contribution to hot dark matter.

However, the masses are sufficiently large (!) that the solution of the solar neutrino puzzle requires a sterile neutrino ν_s [14]. The relevant superpotential couplings are:

$$W_{\nu es} = \Gamma l_1 \nu_s h_u + m_{\nu_s} \nu_s^2, \quad (21)$$

The coefficients Γ and m_s should be strongly suppressed in order to guarantee a light $\nu_e - \nu_s$ system. This can be realized with a $U(1)$ - $\mathcal{R}$ symmetry [15, 12, 11]. With the oscillation parameters

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta m_{es}^2 &\simeq m_{\nu_s}^2 \sim 10^{-6} \text{ eV}^2, \\ \sin^2 2\theta_{es} &\simeq 4 \left(\frac{\Gamma h_u}{m_{\nu_s}} \right)^2 \sim 6 \cdot 10^{-3}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

one finds

$$m_{\nu_e \nu_s} \equiv \Gamma h_u \sim 4 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ eV}, \quad m_{\nu_s} \sim 10^{-3} \text{ eV}. \quad (23)$$

The couplings of more heavy ν_μ and ν_τ states with ν_s are expected to be of the order of $\frac{\Gamma}{\epsilon^{n+k}}(\nu_\tau + \epsilon^n \nu_\mu) h_u$. Taking into account (10) and (23) we will have $\Gamma/\epsilon^{n+k} h_u \lesssim 0.1$ eV, which do not exceed to m and therefore the results presented above will be unchanged.

The above discussion shows how one can obtain maximal mixing between two ‘active’ neutrinos, in this case ν_μ , ν_τ , which is in good agreement with the atmospheric neutrino experiments. This scenario is accompanied by the small mixing angle MSW solution involving $\nu_e - \nu_s$. We now consider how an alternate description is possible in which $\nu_\mu - \nu_s$ oscillations resolve the atmospheric anomaly, while $\nu_e - \nu_\tau$ vacuum oscillations resolve the solar neutrino puzzle. It turns out that this ‘bi-maximal’ mixing scenario permits the existence of neutrino hot dark matter, with contribution to the cosmological density parameter of $0.2 - 0.25$. Models of structure formation with both cold and hot dark matter [16] are in good agreement with the observations.

We introduce the MSSM singlet states $\mathcal{N}_{1,3}$ and ν_s , such that

$$Q_{\mathcal{N}_1} = -(p' + r'), \quad Q_{\mathcal{N}_3} = p', \quad (24)$$

($0 < p' \leq n + k$, $r' \geq 0$). The relevant superpotential couplings involving the $\mathcal{N}$ states are

$$\begin{pmatrix} l_1 \\ l_2 \\ l_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{N}_1 & \mathcal{N}_3 \\ \epsilon^{n+k+p'+r'} & \epsilon^{n+k-p'} \\ \epsilon^{n+p'+r'} & 0 \\ \epsilon^{p'+r'} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \kappa' h_u , \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{N}_1 & \mathcal{N}_3 \\ \epsilon^{2(p'+r')} & \epsilon^{r'} \\ \epsilon^{r'} & 0 \end{pmatrix} M' , \quad (25)$$

The sterile state ν_s is required to have large mixing with ν_μ . This means that its $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charge must be such that it avoids forming a 'heavy' state with ν_τ . This is easily achieved if $1 \leq Q_{\nu_s} \leq n$, in which case the mass term for ν_s will also be forbidden. Consider the superpotential couplings

$$W_{\nu_e, \mu \nu_s} = \Gamma' (l_2 + \left(\frac{X}{M_P} \right)^k l_1) h_u. \quad (26)$$

Taking into account the couplings (25), (26) and integrating out the heavy $\mathcal{N}_{1,3}$ states, the mass matrix for the active and sterile neutrinos takes the form:

$$m_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \\ \nu_\tau \\ \nu_s \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e & \nu_\mu & \nu_\tau & \nu_s \\ m' \epsilon^{n+k} & m' \epsilon^n & m' & m \epsilon^k \\ m' \epsilon^n & 0 & 0 & m \\ m' & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ m \epsilon^k & m & 0 & m_s \end{pmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

where $m' = \frac{\kappa'^2 \langle h_u \rangle^2}{M'} \epsilon^{n+k}$, and we have defined $m \equiv \Gamma' \langle h_u \rangle$. m_s is the mass of the sterile neutrino. Farther we will assume that $m_s \ll m$. The required suppressions of Γ' and m_s can be achieved with the help of $\mathcal{U}(1)$ symmetry ([15, 12, 11]).

From (27) we see that $\nu_e - \nu_\tau$ and $\nu_\mu - \nu_s$ form massive states,

$$m_{\nu_1} \simeq m_{\nu_3} \simeq m' , \quad m_{\nu_2} \simeq m_{\nu_s} \simeq m , \quad (28)$$

and for the oscillation parameters we obtain:

$$\Delta m_{e\tau}^2 \sim 2m'^2 \epsilon^{n+k} , \quad \sin^2 2\theta_{e\tau} = 1 - \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{2(n+k)}), \quad (29)$$

$$\Delta m_{\mu s}^2 \simeq 2m(m' \epsilon^{n+k} + m_s) , \quad \sin^2 2\theta_{\mu s} = 1 - \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m_s^2}{m^2}\right). \quad (30)$$

To obtain $\Delta m_{e\tau}^2 \simeq 10^{-10}$ eV² in (29), for $1 \leq n+k \leq 5$, the m' should be taken in the range $\sim 2 \cdot 10^{-5} - 4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ eV respectively. The first term in (30) does not give significant contribution to the $\Delta m_{\mu s}^2$ (for allowed values of m' and $n+k$). The required splitting can occur due to m_s . For $m_s \sim 5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ eV, m can be ~ 3 eV, corresponding to neutrino hot dark matter $\sim 15\%$ of the critical energy density. For larger m_s (say $\sim 2 \cdot 10^{-2}$ eV),

m should be taken less than ~ 1 eV, which implies a non-significant contribution to dark matter.

In summary, the existence of neutrino hot dark matter is predicted in models in which $\nu_\mu - \nu_s$ oscillations with large mixing explain the atmospheric neutrino anomaly, while the large angle $\nu_e - \nu_\tau$ vacuum oscillations resolve the solar neutrino puzzle.

In obtaining maximal mixing between ‘active’ neutrinos the forms of matrices in (19), (27) is crucial, and for the mechanism to work, one has to make sure that the ‘zero’ entries in these matrices will not be (radically) changed. The zero entries were guaranteed by the $\mathcal{U}(1)$ symmetry (see couplings in (18), (25)), and in ν MSSM there is no additional source which could change the picture. However, in models such as flipped $SU(5)$, $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$, or $SO(10)$, in addition to the MSSM ‘matter’ content, we also have the MSSM singlet states ν_i^c with ‘Dirac’ couplings to the left handed neutrinos. Through the seesaw mechanism, they give rise to an additional contribution m'_ν to the neutrino mass matrix. The magnitudes of the appropriate entries of m'_ν depend on the specifics of the model, but for the scenario to work, these must be $\lesssim m\epsilon^n$ (see (19)). One way to achieve this is to introduce additional ‘matter’ singlet (N) states. If N and ν^c superfields form large massive states $M_0\nu_c N$, and the terms $lN h_u$ and N^2 either do not exist or are strongly suppressed (this could be arranged by the $\mathcal{U}(1)$ symmetry), it is easy to verify that after integrating out of the heaviest $\nu^c - N$ states, the neutrino masses will not receive significant contributions from the ‘physics of ν^c sector’, and the large $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ ($\nu_e - \nu_\tau$) mixings will be realized. We will demonstrate this shortly with an explicit example based on flipped $SU(5)$.

Before discussing this case, however, let us mention another possible scenario in which $\nu_e - \nu_\tau$ small angle MSW oscillations resolve the solar neutrino puzzle. Since the ν_τ state must be light it should not mix strongly with ν_μ . Since in this case we do not deal with large mixings between the active neutrino states we do not need to apply mechanism presented (involving $\mathcal{N}$ states) above. It turns out that this case predicts the heaviest neutrinos to be $\lesssim$ eV. Within the framework of ν MSSM and some of its extensions, the mass matrix of the active neutrinos is expected to be as given by (15), with $\nu_e - \nu_\tau$ mixing $\sim \epsilon^{n+k}$. For small angle MSW solution, a good choice is $n+k = 2$, and $m' (= m_\tau) \sim (10^{-3} - 5 \cdot 10^{-3})$ eV, which means that we need a sterile state ν_s to explain the atmospheric anomaly. To avoid large $\nu_\tau - \nu_s$ mixing, n must differ from zero. With the help of $\mathcal{U}(1)$ symmetry, ν_μ will form a ‘degenerate’ massive state with ν_s ($m_{\nu_2} \simeq m_{\nu_s}$). Having Couplings $\Gamma''(\nu_\mu + \epsilon^k \nu_e)\nu_s h_u \equiv m(\nu_\mu + \epsilon^k \nu_e)\nu_s$, the whole neutrino mass matrix will have the form:

$$m_\nu = \begin{matrix} & \nu_e & \nu_\mu & \nu_\tau & \nu_s \\ \begin{matrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \\ \nu_\tau \\ \nu_s \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} m'\epsilon^{2(n+k)} & m'\epsilon^{2n+k} & m'\epsilon^{n+k} & m\epsilon^k \\ m'\epsilon^{2n+k} & m'\epsilon^{2n} & m'\epsilon^n & m \\ m'\epsilon^{n+k} & m'\epsilon^n & m' & 0 \\ m\epsilon^k & m & 0 & m_s \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}, \quad (31)$$

where we will still assume that $m_s \ll m$.

For the oscillation parameters we will have:

$$\Delta m_{\mu s}^2 \simeq m(3m'\epsilon^{2n} + 2m_s), \quad \sin^2 2\theta_{\mu s} = 1 - \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{2n}) - \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m_s^2}{m^2}\right), \quad (32)$$

$$\Delta m_{e\tau}^2 \sim m'^2, \quad \sin^2 2\theta_{e\tau} \sim 4\epsilon^{2(n+k)} \quad (n+k=2). \quad (33)$$

Two cases which give different implications should be considered: (i) For $m_s \sim 5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ eV in order to get $\Delta m_{\mu s}^2 \sim 3 \cdot 10^{-3}$ eV² (for either $n=1$ or 2) the value for m should be taken (according to (32)) $m \sim 3$ eV; (ii) For an increased value of m_s , say $\sim 1.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ eV, (for either $n=1$ or 2) m should be taken $m \sim 1$ eV, which is already not enough to have any appreciable neutrino hot dark matter. As we see the case (i) gives the possibility of existence of the neutrino hot dark matter also in this scenario.

To demonstrate how the scenarios discussed above can be realized in realistic models beyond ν MSSM and, in particular, how the mechanisms work in practice, let us consider the flipped $SU(5)$ model [6]. We picked this model especially since the $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charges of the ‘matter’ superfields are rather precisely determined. The matter content of the model is ⁶:

$$10_i = (q, d^c, \nu^c)_i, \quad \bar{5}_i = (u^c, l)_i, \quad 1_i = e_i^c, \quad (34)$$

where $i=1, 2, 3$ denotes the family index. Their ‘gauge’ $U(1)$ charges are 1, -3 and 5 respectively. Similarly the ‘higgs’ multiplets are :

$$\phi(5) = (h_d, \bar{D}^c), \quad \bar{\phi}(\bar{5}) = (h_u, D^c), \quad H(10), \quad \bar{H}(\bar{10}), \quad (35)$$

with $U(1)$ charges $-2, 2, 1$ and -1 respectively. The VEVs of the scalar components of $H, \bar{H}$ superfields break $SU(5) \times U(1)$ to $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$. The well known doublet-triplet splitting problem is solved through the missing partner mechanism [6].

The superpotential couplings which generate the quark, ‘Dirac’ and charged lepton masses are:

⁶We assume the existence of Z_2 ‘matter’ parity which distinguishes the matter from the higgs supermultiplets.

$$W_Y = \mathcal{A}_{ij} 10_i 10_j \phi + \mathcal{B}_{ij} 10_i \bar{5}_j \bar{\phi} + \mathcal{C}_{ij} \bar{5}_i 1_j \phi , \quad (36)$$

where i, j are family indices. The matrices $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ have entries that depend on powers of ϵ . It is easy to see that the desired hierarchy (3) for the down quarks is achieved if the $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charges of 10_i are related as follows:

$$Q_{10_3} - Q_{10_2} = Q_{10_2} - Q_{10_1} = 1 . \quad (37)$$

From (37) and the known hierarchies of the up quark Yukawa couplings (3), we also have:

$$Q_{\bar{5}_3} - Q_{\bar{5}_2} = Q_{\bar{5}_2} - Q_{\bar{5}_1} = 2 . \quad (38)$$

Similarly, from (7) and (38) we find:

$$Q_{1_3} = Q_{1_2} , \quad Q_{1_2} - Q_{1_1} = 1 . \quad (39)$$

Given (37), (38) and (39), we can determine the structure of the Yukawa matrices $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$:

$$\mathcal{A}_{ij} \sim \epsilon^{a+6-i-j} , \quad \mathcal{B}_{ij} \sim \epsilon^{9-i-2j} ,$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{ij} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon^5 & \epsilon^4 & \epsilon^4 \\ \epsilon^3 & \epsilon^2 & \epsilon^2 \\ \epsilon & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \epsilon^a , \quad (40)$$

where $0 \leq a \leq 2$ determines the value of the MSSM parameter $\tan \beta (\sim \frac{m_t}{m_b} \epsilon^a)$.

Since the left handed leptons are contained in the $\bar{5}$ -plets, from (38) and (9), we see that we are dealing with the case $(n, k) = (2, 2)$. Therefore, without some suitable extension of this minimal scheme, we expect the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing angle $\theta_{\mu\tau} \sim \epsilon^2$, in strong disagreement with the data. The choice $(n, k) = (2, 2)$ tells us that we should suitably enlarge the model, so as to accommodate large angle $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ oscillations for the atmospheric anomaly, while the solar neutrino puzzle can be resolved through the small mixing angle (MSW) oscillations of ν_e into a sterile state ν_s (the other two scenarios, it turns out, either give $m_{\nu_\mu} \sim 1$ keV or $\theta_{e\tau} \sim \epsilon^4$, both of which are unacceptable).

To implement this scenario, we will take the horizontal $\mathcal{U}(1)$ symmetry to be an $\mathcal{R}$ symmetry. This will be crucial for the natural generation of appropriate mass scales in the neutrino sector. We introduce the singlet states $\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3$ and ν_s . Let us prescribe the following $\mathcal{R}$ charges to the various superfields:

$$R_{10_i} = (R - R_\phi)/2 - (4 - i)R_X , \quad R_{\bar{5}_i} = (R + R_\phi)/2 - R_{\bar{\phi}} - (5 - 2j)R_X ,$$

$$R_{1_1} = (R - 3R_\phi)/2 + R_{\bar{\phi}} - 4R_X, \quad R_{1_2} = R_{1_3} = R_{1_1} + R_X$$

$$R_{\mathcal{N}_2} = (R - R_\phi)/2 - R_H - R_X, \quad R_{\mathcal{N}_3} = R_{\mathcal{N}_2} + 2R_X, \quad R_{\bar{H}} = R_\phi/2, \quad (41)$$

where $R_\phi, R_{\bar{\phi}}, R_H$ and R_X remain undetermined. This choice corresponds to $a = 2$ in (40), which means that the MSSM parameter $\tan\beta$ is not too far from unity.

The superpotential couplings involving $\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3$ fields are

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bar{5}_2 \\ \bar{5}_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{N}_2 & \mathcal{N}_3 \\ \epsilon^2 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \frac{\bar{\phi}H}{M_P}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{N}_2 \\ \mathcal{N}_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{N}_2 & \mathcal{N}_3 \\ \epsilon^2 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \left(\frac{\bar{H}H}{M_P^2}\right)^2 M_P. \quad (42)$$

We see from (42) that the coefficient $\kappa \sim \epsilon_G (= M_{GUT}/M_P)$, the mass scale $M \sim M_P \epsilon_G^4$ (see (18)), and $m \sim \kappa^2 \langle h_u \rangle^2 / M \sim \langle h_u \rangle^2 / (M_P \epsilon_G^2) \simeq 0.13$ eV, which is precisely what is needed for the $n = 2$ case (see discussion after (20)). Here $p = 1$, $r = 0$ and $n \rightarrow n+1$, $k \rightarrow k+1$ (what matters are the relative values of the $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charges). After integrating out the $\mathcal{N}$ states, the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mass matrix will have precisely the desired form (19). We therefore should expect $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ oscillations with the parameters given by (20).

The allowed couplings $\left(\frac{X}{M}\right)^{8-i-j} 10_i 10_j \bar{H}^2 / M_P$ generate masses for ν^c states which, through the seesaw mechanism, yield contribution to the (2,2) element of matrix (19) $\sim \langle h_u \rangle^2 / (M_P \epsilon_G^2 \epsilon^2) \simeq 3$ eV. This would spoil the picture of maximal mixing in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector. For things to work out, we introduce additional singlet superfields N_i (one per generation), with $\mathcal{R}$ charges $R_{N_i} = R/2 + (4-i)R_X$. With the couplings $\left(\frac{X}{M_P}\right)^{i-j} N_i 10_j \bar{H}$ permitted, but the couplings $N_i N_j$ and $N_i \bar{5}_j \cdot \bar{\phi}H / M_P$ forbidden by the $\mathcal{R}$ -symmetry, integration of the heaviest $N - \nu^c$ states will not yield any contribution to the light neutrino masses. We have also checked that after integration of $N - \nu^c$ states, the forms of couplings (42) are not changed. In other words, maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing through our mechanism can be realized in flipped $SU(5)$.

The resolution of the solar neutrino puzzle requires a sterile state ν_s with $\mathcal{R}$ charge given by $R_{\nu_s} = (R - R_\phi)/2 - R_H - 17R_X$. The relevant couplings are:

$$\left(\frac{X}{M_P}\right)^{20} \frac{H}{M_P} \bar{5}_1 \nu_s \bar{\phi} + \left(\frac{\bar{H}H}{M_P^2}\right)^2 \left(\frac{X}{M_P}\right)^{34} M_P \nu_s^2, \quad (43)$$

from which, the corresponding mass scales are

$$m_{\nu_e \nu_s} \sim (2 \cdot 10^{-5} - 10^{-4}) \text{ eV}, \quad m_{\nu_s} \sim (4 \cdot 10^{-5} - 10^{-3}) \text{ eV}. \quad (44)$$

Comparison with expression (23) shows that the solar neutrino puzzle is resolved via the small mixing angle MSW solution.

In conclusion, we have presented a rather general scheme for realizing maximal (and even bi-maximal) mixing in realistic models such as ν MSSM and supersymmetric GUTs. Except in special cases, we are led to introduce a sterile neutrino so as to resolve the solar and atmospheric neutrino puzzles [17]. A $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry, especially if it happens to be a $\mathcal{R}$ -symmetry, can nicely protect the sterile neutrino from becoming heavy. This symmetry, in addition, helps provide a consistent framework for understanding the charged fermion mass hierarchies, as well as the magnitudes of the CKM matrix elements. Neutrino hot dark matter can arise in models which exhibit either bi-maximal neutrino mixing or maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_s$ and small angle $\nu_e - \nu_\tau$ MSW oscillations.

References

- [1] T. Kajita, hep-ex/9810001.
- [2] J.N. Bahcall, P.I. Krastev, A.Yu. Smirnov, Phys. Rev. D 58 (1998) 096016; See also references therein.
- [3] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in: Supergravity, eds. P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Freedman (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979) p. 315; T. Yanagida, Prog. Th. Phys. B 135 (1979) 66.
- [4] J. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. D 10 (1974) 275.
- [5] H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, Ann. Phys. 93 (1975) 193; H. Georgi, in Particles and Fields - 1974, Proc. of the APS 1974 Meeting, ed. C.A. Carlson, AIP, New York, 1975.
- [6] I. Antoniadis et al., Phys. Lett. B 194 (1987) 231; J. Ellis et al., Nucl. Phys. B 311 (1983) 1; G.K. Leontaris and J.D. Vergados, Phys. Lett. B 305 (1993) 242; For a recent discussion see K.T. Mahantappa and S. Oh, hep-ph/9807231; For the non SUSY case see S.M. Barr, Phys. Lett. B 112 (1982) 219.
- [7] For some recent works using $U(1)$ flavor symmetry, see P. Binetruy, S. Lavignac and P. Ramond, Nucl. Phys. B 447 (1996) 353; P. Ramond, R.G. Roberts and G. Ross; Nucl. Phys. B 406 (1993) 19; K. Choi, K. Hwang and E.J. Chun, hep-ph/9811363; For a recent review and additional references see S. Lola and J.D. Vergados, hep-ph/980869.
- [8] P. Ramond, hep-ph/9808489, and references therein; See also J. Sato and T. Yanagida, hep-ph/9809307; F. Vissani, hep-ph/9810435.

- [9] For somewhat different approaches to neutrino masses and mixings in $SO(10)$ GUTs see, for instance, K.S. Babu and Q. Shafi; Phys. Lett. B 294 (1992) 235; B. Brahmachari and R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. D 58 (1998) 015003; C.H. Albright, K.S. Babu and S.M. Barr, hep-ph/9805266.
- [10] H. Fritzsch and Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B 372 (1996) 265, 440 (1998) 313, hep-ph/9807234; H. Fritzsch hep-ph/9810398; M. Fukugita, M. Tanimoto and T. Yanagida, hep-ph/9809554; M. Tanimoto, hep-ph/9807283, 9807517; V. Barger et al., hep-ph/9806387; Y. Nomura, T. Yanagida, hep-ph/9807325; M. Jezabek and Y. Sumino, hep-ph/9807310; H. Georgi and S.L. Glashow, hep-ph/9808293; R. Mohapatra and S. Nussinov, hep-ph/9808301, 9809415; G. Altarelli and F. Ferugio, hep-ph/9809596; C. Giunti, hep-ph/9810272; C.D. Froggat, M. Gibson, H.B. Nielsen, hep-ph/9811265; S.K. Kang, C.S. Kim, hep-ph/9811379.
- [11] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, hep-ph/9811282.
- [12] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, hep-ph/9807502.
- [13] P. Binetruy et al., Nucl. Phys. B 496 (1997) 3; V. Barger, T.J. Weiler and K. Whisnant, Phys. Lett. B 427 (1998) 97; Y. Grossman, Y. Nir and Y. Shadmi, hep-ph/9808355; In the context of realistic $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ model with maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing, it was also discussed in ref. [11].
- [14] For constraints on the sterile states from nucleosynthesis and related discussions see S. Sarkar, Rep. Prog. Phys. 59 (1996) 1493; R. Foot and R.R. Volkas, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75 (1995) 4350.
- [15] E.J. Chun, A.S. Joshipura, A.Yu. Smirnov, Phys. Lett. B 357 (1995) 608; Phys. Rev. D 54 (1996) 4654.
- [16] Q. Shafi and F. Stecker, Phys. Rev. Lett. 53 (1984) 1292; R.K. Schaefer, Q. Shafi and F.W. Stecker, Ap. J 347 (1989) 575; R.K. Schaefer and Q. Shafi, Nature 359 (1992) 199; J.R. Primack et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 2160.
- [17] In this paper we have not attempted to explain the LSND results of C. Athanassopoulos et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 75 (1995) 2650; 77 (1996) 3082; nucl-ex/9706006.